

# LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

## REPORT FORM

This form is intended as a convenience in reporting observations of species on the Louisiana Bird Records Committee (LBRC) Review List. The LBRC recommends the use of this form or a similar format when submitting records for review to assure that all pertinent information is accounted for. Attach additional pages or files as necessary. Please print or type for hard copy. For electronic copy, be sure to save this file to your computer before entering text. Attach field notes, drawings, photographs, or tape recordings, if available. Include all photos for more obscurely marked species. When completed (if hard copy), mail to Secretary, Louisiana Bird Records Committee, c/o Museum of Natural Science, 119 Foster Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3216, or e-mail electronic copy as an attachment to Paul Edward Conover at <[zoiseaux@lusfiber.net](mailto:zoiseaux@lusfiber.net)> .

1. English and Scientific names: Red-legged Honeycreeper (*Cyanerpes cyaneus*)
2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): 3, one male, two female-types
3. Parish: Jefferson  
Specific Locality: TNC Landry-LeBlanc Tract, Grand Isle, LA (behind Sureway grocery)
4. Date(s) when observed: 16 October 2022
5. Time(s) of day when observed: 10:35 – 11:15 am
6. Reporting observer and city/state address

Reporting observer: Erik I. Johnson
City: Sunset
State: Louisiana
7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): Garrett Rhyne
8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): About 40 birders were at the spot, some from LA, and some from around the country. Charlie Lyon was the first to spot the birds this morning. The birds were first found a few days earlier by Melvin Weber.
9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): Sunny. Most of the time the birds were above us in the subcanopy, against bright blue skies.

10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): Vortex Razor 10x42 binoculars. Photos with Nikon D7200, Sigma 150-600mm f/6.3 lens.

11. Distance to bird(s): Generally 20-50 feet for the majority of the observation.

12. Duration of observation: about 40 minutes (per photograph time stamps)

13. Habitat: coastal maritime (live oak) forest

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): I first saw the birds just after Charlie called them out in the turk's cap, as they flew over (just above canopy level) from the turk's cap patch toward the "beer can spot." Within a couple minutes, they were found actively foraging at the beer can spot, where they remained with nearly continuous observation for about 40 minutes. A 3<sup>rd</sup> bird (female-type) briefly joined them around 10:42am – I was watching the two primary birds (female-type and male) actively foraging together when a 3<sup>rd</sup> appeared about 30 feet behind them, also in the subcanopy. I wasn't able to get any photos, as it quickly flew back to the NE and out of sight. See attached sketch of locations and relative position of birds.

15. Description (include only what was actually seen, *not what "should" have been seen*; include if possible: total length/relative size compared to other familiar species; body bulk, shape, proportions; bill, eye, leg, and plumage characteristics. Stress features that separate it from similar species, *or for species that are known to hybridize frequently, stress features that help eliminate possible hybrids*):

Male bird with jet black wings and tail, and bright red legs; otherwise all green. The outer greater coverts were black, with about 3 inner ones being green. The median coverts were paler green with pale tips. It had a darkish eye-line. One electric blue feather could be seen on the left side of the rump. Female-types with olive greater coverts and mostly green elsewhere including drab green wing and tail feathers, and dull reddish legs. The primary female was slightly streaked and smudgy in the breast. It had a faint blackish eye line with a paler supercilium. I didn't not get to this level of detail in the second female, except noting that it had greenish wings. All three birds had a blackish slightly curved, long, thin bill.

The male appeared to be fairly far along toward a complete molt. I initially didn't notice this, but in DSC\_3393 it appears that s4-6 are retained, and that the outer primaries may be molting (with at least p9 still retained). Interestingly, this molt doesn't seem to be including blue body feathers.

The female was also molting, but perhaps not as far along. The inner few primaries appear to be replaced compared to a block of several outer primaries (DSC\_3303).

16. Voice: Thin piercing “tseet” calls heard several times. One call type appeared thinner and sharper and the other with a slight undulation. Would be very hard for me to distinguish from a flight call of many warblers.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): The only other birds that have the combination of bill shape and overall greenish plumage would be in the genus *Cyanerpes*. *C. nitidus* also has red legs, but the female plumage is different in being more streaked below with a distinctly buffy throat. It would also be shorter tailed. The other two *Cyanerpes* species have yellow legs. Female *Chlorophanes* superficially looks like the female, but has dark legs. Some *Dacnis* with red legs have shorter more warbler-like bills (e.g., *D. cayana*).

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Yes, photos and audio recordings.

19. Previous experience with this species: I’ve seen this species in Costa Rica (1994, 2005, and 2016) and Amazonian Brazil (2007-2010 & 2013), and have at least some (dated) field experience with the other three *Cyanerpes* species, and always have to refresh myself on the combination of field characters that separate species.

20. Identification aids: (list books, illustrations, other birders, etc. used in identification):

a. at time of observation: None

b. after observation: Hilty’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Birds of Venezuela, Cornell’s Birds of the World online, Macaulay Library

21. This description is written from:

<input type="checkbox"/>	notes made during the observation.	Are notes attached?	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	notes made after the observation.	At what date?	10/17/2022
X	memory		
<input type="checkbox"/>	study of images		

22. Are you positive of your identification? If not, explain: Yes

23. Date: 25 October 2022

Time: 8:45 pm

24. May the LBRC have permission to display in whole or in part this report and accompanying photos on the LOS-LBRC website and LBRC Facebook page? Yes

If yes, may we include your name with the report? Yes